



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,802	11/20/2002	Martin Trapp	YOR920020159US1	6567

877 7590 11/23/2004

IBM CORPORATION, T.J. WATSON RESEARCH CENTER  
P.O. BOX 218  
YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598

EXAMINER
----------

BAUM, RONALD

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2136

DATE MAILED: 11/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/065,802

Applicant(s)

TRAPP ET AL.

Examiner

Ronald Baum

Art Unit

2136

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 6 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) #
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-35 are pending for examination.
2. Claims 1-35 are rejected.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schneier et al, U.S. Patent 6,099,408.

4. As per claim 1; "A computer-based method for a multiparty electronic service [i.e., Abstract, whereas the playing of electronic games over a network by one or more players corresponds to the 'multiparty electronic service'], the method comprising steps of negotiating a machine interpretable service specification between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on a host system [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'service specification between all parties' as to the setup prior to playing online games/establishing associated random number information associated with said playing of games.]; defining said service specification to: identify cooperating parties [i.e., col. 1,

Art Unit: 2136

lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'identify cooperating parties'.]; identify a requestor and format of a service request, said request is adapted to contain information about an individual [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'requestor and format of a service request' insofar as the communications protocols of the game initiator at least is concerned (i.e., figure 4 and associated description).]; conduct conditional processing steps required for said service request, said conditional processing steps is adapted to use stored data about said individual [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'conditional processing steps is adapted to use stored data about said individual'.]; and provide conditional notifications, said notifications is adapted to include additional information about the individual described in the request [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'additional information about the individual described in the request' insofar as the requestor clearly must have submitted user information in the game registration process as any of the other player are similarly required to do so.]; providing a secure computation environment in said host system [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the cryptographic processors, on a per player user client terminal and server side host, clearly teaches of 'secure computation environment'.]; uploading said service specification into said

Art Unit: 2136

secure computation environment [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'uploading said service specification' insofar as the clients and servers clearly have the same rules and all associated information required to play.]; enforcing said service specification with regards to all cooperating parties [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'enforcing said service specification with regards to all cooperating parties' insofar as the clients and servers clearly have the same rules and all associated information required to play, and as such use said information during the actual game playing.]; receiving a service request from said requestor [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the subsequent to the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'receiving a service request from said requestor' insofar as the clients and servers clearly have the same rules and all associated information required to play, and as such use said information during the actual game playing.]; providing a secure co-processor in said secure computation environment for processing said service request, where said secure processing includes: determining the service specification that governs said service request; validating the actual requestor and the content of the service request against an expected requestor and expected contents as defined in the service specification; and executing the conditional processing and the notifications as defined in the service specification [i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the cryptographic processors, on a per player user client terminal and server side host, clearly teaches of 'secure computation

Art Unit: 2136

environment' insofar as the authentication and actual game playing cryptographic functions serviced via the cryptographic processor secure computing environment.].”;

Further, as per claim 17; “Apparatus [This claim is the system claim for the method claim 1 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 1 rejection] for a multiparty electronic service, the apparatus comprising: at least one host computer adapted to have at least one secure co-processor operating in a secure computation environment, said at least one host computer operative to: negotiate a machine interpretable service specification between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on said host computer; upload said service specification into said secure computation environment; enforce said service specification with regards to all cooperating parties; receive a service request from a requestor; execute secure processing of said service request; and provide notifications as defined in the service specification.”;

Further, as per claim 35; “A program storage device readable by a machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform methods steps [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 17 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 17 rejection] for managing a matching identification service, the method comprising the steps of: negotiating a machine interpretable service specification between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on a host system; defining said service specification to: identify cooperating parties; identify a requestor and format of a service request, said request is adapted to contain information about an individual; conduct conditional processing steps required for said service request, said conditional processing steps is adapted to use stored data about said individual; and provide

Art Unit: 2136

conditional notifications, said notifications is adapted to include additional information about the individual described in the request; providing a secure computation environment in said host system; uploading said service specification into said secure computation environment; enforcing said service specification with regards to all cooperating parties; receiving a service request from said requestor; providing a secure co-processor in said secure computation environment for processing said service request, where said secure processing includes: determining the service specification that governs said service request; validating the actual requestor and the content of the service request against an expected requestor and expected contents as defined in the service specification; and executing the conditional processing and the notifications as defined in the service specification.”.

Further, as per claim 34; “An article of manufacture [This claim is the embodied software claim for the method claim 1 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 1 rejection] for use in a multiparty electronic service, comprising a machine readable medium tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by a machine for implementing a method, the method comprising steps of: negotiating a machine interpretable service specification between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on a host system; defining said service specification to: identify cooperating parties; identify a requestor and format of a service request, said request is adapted to contain information about an individual; conduct conditional processing steps required for said service request, said conditional processing steps is adapted to use stored data about said individual; and provide conditional notifications, said notifications is adapted to include additional information about the individual described in the request; providing a secure computation environment in said host

Art Unit: 2136

system; uploading said service specification into said secure computation environment; enforcing said service specification with regards to all cooperating parties-,receiving a service request from said requestor; providing a secure co-processor in said secure computation environment for processing said service request, where said secure processing includes: determining the service specification that governs said service request; validating the actual requestor and the content of the service request against an expected requestor and expected contents as defined in the service specification; and executing the conditional processing and the notifications as defined in the service specification.”.

5. Claim 2 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of allowing at least one party of said cooperating parties to cancel said service specification wherein all future service requests that rely on said cancelled service specification will be rejected.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17,line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12,lines 35-col 17,line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he doesn’t want to continue, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the number of wagers type of specification for playing a given game round setup, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass ‘one party of said cooperating parties to cancel said service specification wherein all future service requests that rely on said cancelled service specification will be rejected’.).



Art Unit: 2136

6. Claim 3 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 2 wherein said steps of negotiating a machine interpretable service specification, uploading, enforcing, receiving a service request, and canceling said service specification comprises the step of conducting said previous steps multiple times.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he doesn’t want to continue, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the number of wagers type of specification for playing a given game round setup, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass ‘previous steps multiple times’ such that multiple rounds of play are clearly playable.);

Further, as per claim 22 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; “The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer operative to negotiate said machine interpretable service specification, upload said service specification, enforce said service specification, and receive a service request, is further operative to conduct said negotiating, uploading, enforcing and receiving functions multiple times.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he doesn’t want to continue, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the number of wagers type of specification for playing a given game round setup, as broadly

Art Unit: 2136

interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass 'previous steps multiple times' such that multiple rounds of play are clearly playable.).

7. Claim 4 ***additionally recites*** the limitation that; "The method of claim 1 further comprising the steps of: negotiating multiple machine interpretable service specifications; defining said multiple service specifications; uploading said multiple service specifications into said secure computation environment; and enforcing said multiple service specifications with regards to all cooperating parties.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he wants to continue playing, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the number of wagers type of specification for playing a given game in a *multi round* setup, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass 'multiple service specifications with regards to all cooperating parties' .);

Further, as per claim 28 ***additionally reciting*** the limitation that; "The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer operative to negotiate a machine interpretable service specification between all parties is further operative to: negotiate multiple machine interpretable service specifications; define said multiple service specifications; upload said multiple service specifications into said secure computation environment; and enforce said multiple service specifications with regards to all cooperating parties.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of

Art Unit: 2136

wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he wants to continue playing, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the number of wagers type of specification for playing a given game in a *multi round* setup, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass 'multiple service specifications with regards to all cooperating parties' ).

8. Claim 5 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 4 wherein said secure processing steps further comprises the step of having at least one of said secure processing steps being executed unconditionally." The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he wants to play per se, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the fact that the secure processing via the cryptographic processor(s) used in the authentication or for as game appropriate, random number generation services, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass 'secure processing steps being executed unconditionally' ).

9. Claim 6 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 1 wherein said secure processing steps further comprises the step of having at least one of said secure processing steps use data provided in said service request and found in said host system to derive further information about said individual described in said service request." The teachings of

Art Unit: 2136

Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he wants to play per se, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the fact that the secure processing via the cryptographic processor(s) used in the authentication or for as game appropriate, random number generation services, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass 'at least one of said secure processing steps use data provided in said service request and found in said host system to derive further information about said individual described in said service request' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process.);

Further, as per claim 23 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; "The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to use data provided in said service request and found in said host computer to derive further information about an individual described in said service request.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as if any player decides he wants to play per se, that criteria, at the least, is inherent in the fact that the secure processing via the cryptographic processor(s) used in the authentication or for as game appropriate, random number generation services, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would

Art Unit: 2136

clearly encompass 'at least one of said secure processing steps use data provided in said service request and found in said host system to derive further information about said individual described in said service request' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process.).

10. Claim 7 ***additionally recites*** the limitation that; "The method of claim 6 wherein said at least one of said secure processing steps further comprises the step of computing a correlation between biometric data provided in said service request and biometric data looked up in said host system.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 6, lines 39-65, col. 15, lines 66-col. 16, line 64, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the appropriate use of biometrics, as broadly interpreted by the examiner, and would thus clearly encompass 'correlation between biometric data provided in said service request and biometric data looked up in said host system'.);

Further, as per claim 24 ***additionally reciting*** the limitation that; "The apparatus of claim 23 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to compute a correlation between biometric data provided in said service request and biometric data looked up in said host computer.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 6, lines 39-65, col. 15, lines 66-col. 16, line 64, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly,

Art Unit: 2136

clearly teaches of the appropriate use of biometrics, as broadly interpreted by the examiner, and would thus clearly encompass 'correlation between biometric data provided in said service request and biometric data looked up in said host system'.);

Further, as per claim 25 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; "The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to compute a correlation between biometric data provided in said service request and biometric data looked up in said host computer The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 6, lines 39-65, col. 15, lines 66-col. 16, line 64, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the appropriate use of biometrics, as broadly interpreted by the examiner, and would thus clearly encompass 'correlation between biometric data provided in said service request and biometric data looked up in said host system'.).

11. Claim 8 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 1 wherein said step of providing conditional notifications further comprises the step of providing an empty message.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass 'providing conditional notifications further comprises the step of providing an empty message' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for

Art Unit: 2136

further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said empty messages.);

Further, as per claim 26 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; “The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer operative to provide notifications is further operative to provide an empty message”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass ‘providing conditional notifications further comprises the step of providing an empty message’ insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said empty messages.).

12. Claim 9 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 1 wherein said step of negotiating a machine interpretable service specification between all parties further comprises the step of providing a contract for governing the negotiated service specification.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col

Art Unit: 2136

17,line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of ‘providing a contract for governing the negotiated service specification’ as to the setup prior to playing online games insofar as the contract at the very least involves the financial/payment aspects of the player (i.e., his credit card information).);

Further, as per claim 21 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; “The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to provide a contract for governing the negotiated service specification.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17,line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12,lines 35-col 17,line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of ‘providing a contract for governing the negotiated service specification’ as to the setup prior to playing online games insofar as the contract at the very least involves the financial/payment aspects of the player (i.e., his credit card information).).

13. Claim 10 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 1 wherein said secure processing steps further comprises the step of notifying said requestor that said service request was processed.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17,line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12,lines 35-col 17,line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of ‘step of notifying said requestor that said service request was processed’ as to the setup prior to playing online



Art Unit: 2136

games insofar as the contract at the very least involves the financial/payment aspects of the player (i.e., his credit card information), and confirming a credit card is sufficiently funded.);

Further, as per claim 29 *additionally reciting* the limitation that, “The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer operative to provide notifications is further operative to notify said requestor that said service request was processed.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of ‘step of notifying said requestor that said service request was processed’ as to the setup prior to playing online games insofar as the contract at the very least involves the financial/payment aspects of the player (i.e., his credit card information), and confirming a credit card is sufficiently funded.).

14. Claim 11 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 1 wherein said step of enforcing said service specification further comprises the step of uploading at least one database from at least one party of said cooperating parties, information contained therein from said at least one database is stored in said host system.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as the game rule enforcement associated with specific game playing, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass ‘uploading at least one database ...

Art Unit: 2136

is stored in said host system' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process.);

Further, as per claim 27 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; "The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to upload at least one database from at least one party of said cooperating parties, information contained therein from said at least one database is adapted to be stored in said host computer.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches, insofar as the game rule enforcement associated with specific game playing, as broadly interpreted by the examiner would clearly encompass 'uploading at least one database ... is stored in said host system' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process.).

15. Claim 12 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 4 wherein said step of negotiating multiple machine interpretable service specifications between any cooperating parties further comprises the step of providing a contract for governing each negotiated service specification.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such

Art Unit: 2136

limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of wagers, game selection, players selection/authentication, payment authorization, etc., on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'providing a contract for governing each negotiated service specification' as to the setup prior to playing online games insofar as the contract at the very least involves the financial/payment aspects of the player (i.e., his credit card information).).

16. Claim 13 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The method of claim 1 wherein said step of providing conditional notifications further comprises the step of providing a notification that is adapted to contain information about said individual.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass 'providing a notification that is adapted to contain information about said individual' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages.);

Art Unit: 2136

Further, as per claim 30 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; “The apparatus of claim 27 wherein said at least one host computer operative to provide notifications is further operative to provide conditional notifications that is adapted to contain information about an individual.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass ‘providing a notification that is adapted to contain information about said individual’ insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages.).

17. Claim 14 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 13, wherein said step of providing a notification that is adapted to contain information about said individual further comprises the step of providing said notification to at least one party of said cooperating parties, said at least one party of said cooperating parties is a party other than said requestor.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging

Art Unit: 2136

protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass 'providing said notification ... other than said requestor' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages, and further, the multiple players client network nodes clearly communicate interactively during game setup and actual game playing.);

Further, as per claim 31 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; "The apparatus of claim 18 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to provide said conditional notifications to another party of said cooperating parties, said another party of said cooperating parties is a party other than said requestor.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass 'providing said notification ... other than said requestor' insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user

Art Unit: 2136

specified gaming information messages, and further, the multiple players client network nodes clearly communicate interactively during game setup and actual game playing.).

18. Claim 15 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 14, wherein said step of providing a notification to at least one party of said cooperating parties that is adapted to contain information about said individual further comprises the step of providing notification to said at least one party of said cooperating parties that is a party other than a provider of said stored data.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass ‘providing notification ... other than a provider of said stored data’ insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages, and further, the multiple players client network nodes clearly communicate interactively during game setup and actual game playing.);

Further, as per claim 32 *additionally reciting* the limitation that; “The method of claim 31, wherein said at least one host computer operative to provide said conditional notifications to said another party of said cooperating parties is further operative to provide said conditional

Art Unit: 2136

notifications to a party other than a provider of said stored data.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass ‘providing notification ... other than a provider of said stored data’ insofar as the user information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages, and further, the multiple players client network nodes clearly communicate interactively during game setup and actual game playing.).

19. Claim 16 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The method of claim 1 wherein said step of providing conditional notifications further comprises the step of providing a notification to at least one party of said cooperating parties that is adapted to contain no information about said individual.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 5, lines 38-col. 6, line 38, whereas the players selection/authentication on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of the messaging protocols, as broadly interpreted by the examiner and would clearly encompass ‘providing a notification ... to contain no information about said individual’ insofar as the user

Art Unit: 2136

information at the client and server databases associated with the game communicate intermediate results/messages (i.e., handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) as part of the setup/authorization/authentication process, and said messages clearly (i.e., again, in the case of handshaking, authentication results/requests for further information, etc.) encompass said affirmative verification of financial/authentication of user/user specified gaming information messages that in acting as a simple verification/authentication of user without explicit user identification (i.e., acknowledgement of message via IP address and not user of network node at said IP address)).

20. Claim 18 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The apparatus of claim 17, wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to define said service specification to: identify said cooperating parties (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of ‘identify cooperating parties’); identify said requestor and the format of said service request, said request is adapted to contain information about an individual (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of ‘requestor and format of a service request’ insofar as the communications protocols of the game initiator at least is concerned (i.e., figure 4 and associated description).); conduct conditional processing steps required for said service request, said conditional processing steps is adapted to use stored data about said individual (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per



Art Unit: 2136

player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'conditional processing steps is adapted to use stored data about said individual'); and provide conditional notifications, said conditional notifications is adapted to include additional information about the individual described in the request (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of 'additional information about the individual described in the request' insofar as the requestor clearly must have submitted user information in the game registration process as any of the other player are similarly required to do so.).". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28).

21. Claim 19 *additionally recites* the limitation that; "The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to execute said secure processing to: determine the service specification that governs said service request; validate said requestor and the content of the service request against an expected requestor and expected contents as defined in the service specification; and execute conditional processing as defined in the service specification.". The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the cryptographic processors, on a per player user client terminal and server side host, clearly teaches of 'secure computation environment ...' insofar as the authentication and actual game playing cryptographic functions serviced via the cryptographic processor secure computing environment.).

Art Unit: 2136

22. Claim 20 *additionally recites* the limitation that; “The apparatus of claim 17 wherein said at least one host computer is further operative to provide said notifications as conditional notifications that is adapted to include additional information about an individual described in the request.”. The teachings of Schneier et al are directed towards such limitations (i.e., col. 1, lines 55-col. 17, line 28, whereas the setup of players selection/authentication, on a per player per se, and multiple player embodiments (col. 12, lines 35-col 17, line 27), particularly, clearly teaches of ‘additional information about the individual described in the request’ insofar as the requestor clearly must have submitted user information in the game registration process as any of the other player are similarly required to do so.).

23. As per claim 33; “An identification apparatus for matching individuals, the apparatus comprising: at least one host computer adapted to have at least one secure co-processor operating in a secure computation environment, said at least one host computer operative to: negotiate a machine interpretable contract between all parties, which would cooperate with a particular application running on said host computer; upload said contract into said secure computation environment; enforce said contract with regards to all cooperating parties; receive a service request from a requestor, execute secure processing of said service request; and provide notifications as defined in the contract [This claim is the system as applied to the identification aspects of the claim for the method claims 1 and 9 above, and is rejected for the same reasons provided for the claim 1 and 9 rejections].”.

### *Conclusion*

Art Unit: 2136

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Ronald Baum, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3681. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh, can be reached at (571) 272-3795. The Fax number for the organization where this application is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Ronald Baum

Patent Examiner

  
AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100